

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, and 7 are amended hereby. No claims are canceled or added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-8 will remain pending.

In the Office Action dated May 15, 2006, the Examiner acknowledged receipt of the Priority Document for the instant application. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the acknowledgment of the submission of this document.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the phrase "such as" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. In response, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, and 7 and respectfully submits that the amendments overcome the Examiner's rejections. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In connection with the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Applicant respectfully points out that claim 5 does not contain the phrase "such as". Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejection of claim 5 may have been presented in error. In view of this, the Applicant has not amended claim 5 and respectfully submits that claim 5 is patentable as originally presented for examination.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In view of the claim amendments presented herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1-8 are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, withdraw the rejection, and pass this application to issuance.

In connection with the Amendments to claims 1, 3, and 7, the Applicant also respectfully submits that the substitution of the word "including" for the phrase "such as" is not believed to be of such a nature as to limit the application of the doctrine of equivalents to these claims. The Applicant further respectfully submits that the claims are intended to enjoy a broad range of equivalents, just as if this substitution had not been made.

If there are any fees required by the Patent Office to accept entry of this Amendment, please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account

HORIE -- Appln. No. 10/522,145
Attorney Docket: 030952-0310895

Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey D. Karceski", enclosed within a large, loopy oval flourish.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
JEFFREY D. KARCESKI
Reg. No. 35914
Tel. No. 202.663.8403
Fax No. 202.663.8007

Date: July 27, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900